



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FUTURE OF ALSACE-LORRAINE

By David Starr Jordan, LL.D., Chancellor of Leland Stanford University

I

Of all the problems in political geography raised by the war, the one that seems most difficult to settle is that of Alsace-Lorraine. Torn from France, by what its deputies in 1871 rightly called "an odious abuse of force," misruled for forty-five years by dull-witted officials under orders to substitute discipline for freedom, and systematically robbed and abused in the present war, Alsace-Lorraine is under no obligations legal or moral to the German Empire. The claim of France although morally wholly genuine, is legally not much better than that of Germany. In the old dynastic fashion, Emperor Napoleon III, wagered his Rhine provinces against those of the Kaiser and duly lost. Under the rules of the game, the stake went to Germany. The republic which followed the Emperor's downfall perforce weakly abandoned it in the Treaty of Frankfort in order to avoid still greater calamities. The people concerned were not consulted. Under dynastic rule they had no right to be considered, and under absolutism they have acquired none since. Meanwhile the "Tragedy of Pride" as Ferrero calls it, prevents either nation from yielding even to its own advantage.

For fifty and more years the Germans have tried in vain to assimilate the Alsatians, the Danes in Flensburg, and the Poles in Posen. The reason for their failure is that the Prussian government has offered discipline instead of freedom. The fatal word "*Eroberung*" (conquest) has always stood in the way of understanding. No loyalty is possible under the lash.

To her "conquest" of "Elsass-Lothringen" Germany has said in effect: "I will not give you your freedom or equality

until I am sure of your love." Alsace responds: "I cannot love you until you set me free." Lorraine replies: "I am not of your family. I cannot understand your ways." Then Germany says to France: "We cannot be friends until you forget." And France answers: "You will not let me forget, and so I cannot."

Germans as a rule fail to understand the loyalty of South Africa to the British Empire after the unfortunate and unjustified Boer war of conquest. As a matter of fact, South Africa was treated humanly and thus bound by the cement of good-will. With a similar policy on the part of Germany after the war of 1870-1871, there would have been no "problem of Alsace-Lorraine." But statesmen of the type of Campbell-Bannerman rarely come to the front under the dynasty system.

In an article in the *Deutsche Politik*, Professor Martin Fassbinder is quoted as saying;

The French base their claims to Alsace on the fact that the Alsatians are attached in their hearts to France. This unfortunately is only too true. The reproach leveled at us, that we do not understand how to assimilate conquered territories is well founded, and it is a phenomenon which merits our best attention.

In 1659 Colbert wrote to his brother, the first administrator of Alsace, exhorting him to treat the Alsatians better than the inhabitants were treated by their rulers. At the same time he urged the clergy to use their influence to induce the Alsatians to become good Frenchmen. The consequence was that in 1675, when the German troops entered Alsace, they met not with complete indifference, but active hostility on the part of the inhabitants of that province.

With us Germans, an administration of such a nature is impossible. Ours is a régime which admits of no change. Hence, when the functionaries of such a régime treat the inhabitants badly, it is difficult to conciliate them and even more difficult to assimilate them.

II

There are two main fallacies in German discussions of this subject. Alsace, with her republic of Strassburg and her ten free cities, never "belonged to Germany" in a proprietary sense. Germany indeed was little more than a geographical expression when through its own House of

Hapsburg, Alsace became loosely attached to the ramshackle "Holy Roman Empire," of which Austria was finally the chief heir. Through history, Lorraine has been mostly attached to France.

It may be that Alsace-Lorraine now "belongs to Germany," having been held by force in serfdom for forty-seven years. It ought to "belong to the Alsatians." In any event, it is not "a part of Germany," except as a bond-slave is part of his master's household. The territory of "Elsass-Lothringen" is "Reichsland," or land owned by the Empire, inhabited by "Deutsche zweiter Klasse" (second-class Germans) who are legally little more than squatters on public domain.

The second fallacy maintains that the people are German because of their original Swabian origin and because seven-eighths both in Alsace and Lorraine speak in a Swabian dialect to children and servants while using French for other purposes. The question of language has no more importance in Alsace than in Switzerland. The essential to unity is community of experiences and aspirations, not of speech. Most educated Alsatians speak three languages. The leaders of opposition to Prussianism are not of French but German stock, largely from Upper Alsace, especially Colmar and Mülhausen. The names of Waltz ("Oncle Hansi"), Boll, Blumenthal, Wetterle, Helmer, Preiss, Zislin, Frœlich, Weill, indicate this.

In the words of Napoleon; "they speak in German, but they saber in French." "Being German, they are more obstinately French than any Frenchmen could be." A wise administration would never have sought to wreak its discipline by force on a freedom-loving folk. It would have sought rather to promote the Alsatian ideal of international friendship. If Alsace-Lorraine had been given an equal stake in government and the right to rule itself and to maintain its own customs, the "question of Alsace-Lorraine" would long ago have been solved. As matters are, Imperial Germany has forfeited all claim by trying to crowd its own language and discipline on an independent people which has tasted freedom, with a specialized culture

of its own. A strange mentality that which finds honor and glory in holding a fine-spirited body of people against its will in political and social subjugation.

III

But Germany now has reasons other than sentimental for holding the district. Only in recent years has the value of the immense iron mines of Eastern Lorraine been appreciated. These furnish now some 80 per cent of all German iron. This ore, known as "Minette" contains,¹ 2 per cent of phosphorus which made the ore useless until two English chemists, Thomas and Gilchrist, invented (1878), a process by which the phosphorus was thrown into the slag, becoming of itself a valuable fertilizer while the iron was relieved of its presence. This process gave to a part of Lorraine a special value in the eye of Germany. With the fate of the iron of Lorraine or the potash of Alsace, the world has little concern. The advent of natural trade would render political ownership a secondary matter.

It has now been proposed, for the benefit of Prussia, to dismember the united province. This would of course weaken opposition to the severe but "necessary" process of "*Entwelschung*" (deforeignization) while making another substantial addition to the wealth and power of Prussia, to which Kingdom this plan would add Lorraine. Such an adjustment, it is urged, would be a great boon to Lorraine, while inflicting on refractory Alsace a just punishment. The latter would thus find herself permanently excluded from Prussia, "a great state alone capable of guaranteeing to the Alsatian people the free opportunity of public manifestation of their national sentiments." One German journal declared that a "Prussia enlarged by the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine could realize by her all-powerfulness the destinies of the empire." Meanwhile Prussia "never weary of trampling on men's souls," has neither in this case or any other regarded the will of the people concerned as a factor in determining their future.

¹ According to Prof. C. C. Eckhardt, *Scientific Monthly*, May, 1918.

IV

In this deadlock, many have suggested splitting the difference by dividing the territories. Some would make the division lengthwise, giving the French-speaking communes to France. Some would cut crosswise, giving Lorraine to France and Alsace to Germany.

Neither suggestion I think would be final, and certainly neither would be acceptable to the people concerned. Alsace and Lorraine, once very different in temper, have been welded into one by common misfortune. To divide the district would be simply to cripple it. As already indicated, its problem is not one of language, nor of race. There is, moreover, no natural frontier even between the Germanic and the French communes. The center of opposition to Germany lies by no means in the French areas nor in their now more than half-Germanized chief city of Metz, but in Upper Alsace and especially in the ten towns (The "Décapole") which were free cities under the old German empire. These are Mühlhausen, Colmar, Türkheim, Rösheim, Münster, Schlettstadt, Hagenau, Weissenburg, Kaysersburg and Oberehnheim. Later Landau entered the league while Mühlhausen left it to become a canton of Switzerland, afterwards voluntarily joining herself to France. Strassburg, meanwhile, was a republic, ruled by a bishop.

V

It is suggested that the question of Alsace-Lorraine should be settled by a plebiscite at the end of the war, under control of some neutral authority. But then there is at present no such authority and the difficulties in the way are considerable.

The plebiscite, or ballot, is a device for ascertaining the will of the people. It is not clear that this can ever be safe and effective in determining the fate of any disputed district of Europe. The process can have no value unless voting rests on intelligence and the ballot is fully guarded, with a secret vote and the absence of all duress, intimidation, or bribery. As some form of duress is a regular ac-

companiment of the suffrage in many parts of Europe, we can therefore hardly expect the stream to rise above its source. Even in the best-ordered districts a plebiscite as to national allegiance would be fraught with embarrassments. In case of any proposed change in boundaries, public feeling would run high in the states concerned, as well as in the strip of territory to which the plebiscite should be applied. This condition would encourage intrigue, with manipulation of public opinion. The struggle for ascendancy would affect the rest of the world, and sympathies racial, political, religious, would form a disturbing element far beyond the limits of the regions concerned. "I can imagine," says Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, "a plebiscite turning into an active volcano. . . . This provision would operate as an almost insuperable check against any change. It would give the population no initiative, only a vote."

The former bond of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany rested on her busy commerce across the Rhine, and on the large influx of German manufacturing interest in Strassburg and Metz. The persistent though mostly latent opposition was stronger in German Alsace than in French Lorraine, no doubt partly because the French population had been more thoroughly "skimmed" by emigration after the Franco-Prussian war.

Matters of language have assumed importance only through attempts to suppress the use of the French tongue. As before indicated, it is not vital to the unity of a nation that all its people should speak the same language. Stability is secured by equality before the law and the recognition by all that under a common government their individual rights are assured. In the words of Albert Oeri, "A compatriot who thinks our thoughts is nearer to us than one who merely speaks our tongue."

Most attempts to define nationalities by race lines are bound to fall. Language and race cross every border, sometimes producing inextricable mixtures of blood and tongues. Kinship in spirit is the vital essential. The requirement of a unified nation with one race, one speech and one religion

is the method of oriental despotism. It is the watchword of the infamous "Committee of Union and Progress" at Constantinople. Such a demand is out of place in modern international Europe.

VI

Finally, in any discussion of this particular problem must be weighed the claim of France that a plebiscite at the present epoch would be unwise and unfair, as a large part of the population has been banished and replaced by half a million German immigrants, these mostly located in Strassburg, Metz, and the iron district of Lorraine. Still more emphatically, it is urged that the will of the provinces for all time was indicated in the protest of the retiring Alsatian members of the French National Assembly at Bordeaux,—one of the noblest documents in history.

On March 1, 1871, in behalf of the "lost provinces," M. Grosjean uttered this valedictory:

Delivered in scorn of all justice and by the odious use of force, to foreign domination, we have our last duty to perform. We declare once for all as null and void an agreement which disposes of us without our consent. The vindication of our rights rest forever open to all and to each in the form and in the degree his conscience shall dictate. The moment we leave this hall, the supreme thought we find in the bottom of our hearts is a thought of unalterable attachment to the land from which we are torn. Our brothers of Alsace and of Lorraine, separated at this moment from the common family, will preserve to France, absent from their hearths, an affection faithful to the day when she shall return to take her place again.

In an address to Europe at large the delegates used these prophetic words:

Europe cannot permit or ratify the abandonment of Alsace and Lorraine. The civilized states as guardians of justice and national rights cannot remain indifferent to their neighbors under pain of becoming in their turn victims of the outrages they have tolerated. Modern Europe cannot allow a people to be seized like a herd of cattle. She cannot continue deaf to the repeated protests of threatened nationalities. She owes it to her instinct of self-preservation to forbid such uses of power. Peace concluded as the price of a cession of territory could be nothing but a costly truce, not a final peace. It would be for all a cause of internal unrest, a permanent and legitimate provocation of War.

Finally, on March 24, apostrophizing Germany, Frédéric Hartmann made his historic appeal:

By the fact that you have conquered us, you owe us a status in law, a civil and political constitution in harmony with our traditions and with our customs.

But Germany, enmeshed in the *Kultur* regimentation of Prussia could not grant to an *Eroberung* a freedom her own people had never known. "She looked for the reaping of fruit she did not know how to cultivate." For forty years she granted to "Elsass-Lothringen" no constitution at all, and then one "made in Prussia," bearing no relation to the customs and instincts of Alsace-Lorraine.

VII

There is but one fair basis of settlement.

The *land of Alsace-Lorraine belongs to the people of Alsace-Lorraine*, and to no one else. There should be no question as to this. As "men without a country" for half a century, they have made a country of their own, as characteristic and as freedom-loving as its neighbor, Switzerland. Alsace-Lorraine should be set free as an independent state with full right to determine her own future. From an article written by R. M. Bauer of Baden in Aargau favoring the independence of Alsace-Lorraine, now going the rounds of the Swiss papers, I translate the following:

Only an independent, free Alsace-Lorraine brings the guarantee of an epoch of peace in Europe. Both opponents would learn to meet again without hate, to the welfare of common humanity. Alsace-Lorraine would help both to reconciliation. They would themselves be a free people in the future free Europe.

The writer concludes with an appeal to Alsatians in the name of world-peace to work for independence.

But a guaranteed neutral state should remain unfortified. The strong citadels of Strassburg and Metz (France's key to Germany) should be dismantled. A state with guaranteed neutrality should have neither forts nor armies, and these two fortresses have been the main cause of the undoing of the provinces.

It is however an open question whether any buffer state could maintain itself against the will of Imperial Germany and against its own people's love for France. For France as a nation is distinctly lovable, which Prussia is not and can never be. Surely a freed Alsace will drift towards France, and this without a regard to pledges or "guarantees."

While writing this article, I have heard from an Alsatian thoroughly acquainted with the present conditions in that country. He says:

No doubt the feeling among the people is now thoroughly and strongly in favor of France and everybody hopes the country will return to French citizenship. It is the only way of definitely putting an end to the German misgovernment which, especially since the war, has become more and more odious to everybody.

The country is too small to remain independent, the possibilities of developing industry, trade and agriculture would be too small. Besides the Germans would always try to regain their influence, their people would remain in the country, the intrigues would be perpetual as now in Flanders, and no hope left for internal and external peace.

In 1913, the people of Alsace and Lorraine were strongly opposed to war even for their own release, because they realized what war would mean, through most bitter experience. Even more than Belgium had their fields been "the cockpit of Europe." Their hope was to become an equal self-governing state within the German Empire, and through their double linguistics to form a bridge of friendship and understanding between two great nations. Let us be level headed ("têtes carrées") and patient, they urged, for some day Alsace would yet turn the scales in behalf of German liberty. This feeling prevalent before the war was thus expressed by a prominent Alsatian:

It is for the people of these provinces to say loudly and clearly that the demand be made for the friendly bridge between two civilizations—not the glacis of a fort, nor yet the field of battle, we ask "No war; Franco-German reconciliation; self-government for Alsace-Lorraine."

All prospects of "bearable life" under German rule vanished with the attack on Belgium and France.

VIII

All this before August of 1914.

Since then Alsace-Lorraine has suffered acutely in all her interests. Prominent Alsatian leaders have been condemned to death, though fortunately each of them had already taken refuge in France or Switzerland. Even the most conservative of the well-to-do classes have found it necessary to banish themselves, while German officers have engaged in miscellaneous looting, the loot being sold at auction in Stockholm and Amsterdam.

Early in the war, an Alsatian wrote me as follows:

Many persons were imprisoned and exiled to interior Germany without any judgment. Nearly every denunciation, even anonymous ones, are taken as true, and people sent to prison for some weeks. Speaking French in the streets or shops is strictly prohibited. Some villages were burnt down by the army, others were shelled and destroyed. Jewels, furniture and so on were taken away by German officers in automobiles in the villages evacuated by their troops and especially in the castles, in their own land! I never had thought that war could be so cruel and lawless and lose every notion of morals and law.

Daniel Blumenthal, late mayor of Colmar, in a little book entitled *Alsace-Lorraine* tells the story of the reign of terror experienced in the last four years.

In the first place, persons inscribed on the black-list, that is to say, those most suspected, have been arrested and imprisoned. Those who have escaped the talons of the Germans, have been objects of persecution for so-called high treason, liable to capital punishment. They have had their property seized and (supreme misfortune) they have been declared to have forfeited their German nationality.

The Council of War was in permanent operation.

Blumenthal estimates that 30,000 Alsatian soldiers, mobilized in the German army, have gone over into the French. Many of these "have begged to be sent to the front, to fight the Germans, thus risking their lives twice in the service of France."

The mayor adds:

Alsace-Lorraine has suffered under the Prussian rule of Germany. This rule has weakened the strength of the country, but could not kill the spirit of the people. There is but one way in

which the two provinces can regain their health. They must again be united to France, their mother country, their rightful home.

It appears that Alsace-Lorraine has been officially treated as an "enemy country," the true meaning of which term to the Prussian has already been indicated in Belgium, France, Serbia and Armenia—examples which place the German military directorate outside the range of moral comprehension.

A special interest attaches therefore to a little book entitled *L'Épreuve d'Alsace, par un Alsacien* (*The Ordeal of Alsace, by an Alsatian*) which sets forth the conditions in that region for the first two years of the war. The volume is made up of unsigned articles from the *Journal de Genève* (1916). I am assured on unquestionable authority that it is truthful as to facts. Many of the incidents are described from German official sources or quoted from the Pangermanist newspaper the *Strassburger Post*, an exotic in Alsace.

The outbreak of war was presaged by the notorious preliminary skirmish at Saverne (Zabern) in which German civil authority was laid supine under the feet of the German General Staff. The events which succeeded this failure of civil justice were progressively alarming to the people of the provinces. Von Wedel, the "Statthalter," or viceroy of Alsace-Lorraine, and Mandel the Secretary, both of them men of character and ability, as generous as their superiors would permit, resigned their offices, the former being replaced by the reactionary von Dallwitz, a man of iron who would stand no nonsense.

The Alsatians tried to be law-abiding, though new "laws of exception" or "laws of protection" as the Prussians termed them were enacted day by day; statutes they had no part in making nor in enforcing. "Germany had become one vast barrack ruled by Prussian subalterns" and barrack law became the law of Alsace.

All French journals were promptly suppressed, all editors² who had not made their escape being sent to jail.

* A letter from the writer to Léon Boll, editor of the influential *Journal d'Alsace-Lorraine* was returned from Strassburg by the military authorities marked *flüchtig* (fugitive), and "fugitive" also were the members of the nationalist group whose names I have already mentioned.

Black lists of *Französlinge* (Frenchlings)³ arose to meet the demand and the reign of persecution gave place to a reign of terror.

At first, I am informed, Alsace accepted the characteristic fiction that "war had been forced on Germany" and that she had no choice save to fight. Returning soldiers from the Belgian campaigns dispelled this illusion and the feeling against Prussia grew stronger and stronger as the opportunities for expression grew less.

At a banquet of German sympathizers at Gebweiler in Upper Alsace (April, 1915) the orator, Professor van der Pforten spoke in the following vein:

Germany is now completely united and providence has chosen the German people to subject all Europe to a radical cure which shall be to her a blessing of Heaven.

This cure was then rigorously applied in Alsace as well as in Belgium. "After the war," said the wife of another professor from the now Prussianized university of Strassburg "the Alsatians ought to lick our feet."

It was made clear that the "laws of exception," with their excessive limitations of personal freedom, would not end with the present conflict, but were "rather to be continued until the whole population had made a complete submission, that is, for an unlimited time."

The new Pangermanist governor, von Dallwitz, spoke of the liberal hopes of the Alsatians as "the extravagant and altogether grotesque fancies of a double culture" with "that other chimera of the rôle of mediator of the national frontier" "The Alsatians are called by the geographic situation and their past history to form an impassible rampart of culture and mentality purely German." This was a warning that all their ambitions of culture and liberalism must be given up and that they must henceforth become like the mass of Prussians, intellectual and spiritual slaves, "bricks in the wall of an edifice they could not see and need not understand." "A broom of iron," said the Pangermanist Lienhardt, "will clean up Alsace, if the young Alsatians do not take up this duty themselves."

* Called by the Alsatians "francillous."

Early in the war, the German authorities took possession of all properties belonging to French owners in Alsace-Lorraine, all employees suspected of French leanings being dismissed. Further it was intended to buy up all these properties at the end of the war, and to replace their owners and their personnel by Germans. Such a move, it was said, "would be a benefit to the provinces, as they had not realized the system of intense agriculture practiced in Germany." By this means also, old soldiers were to be colonized in Alsace "thus assuring the veterans a comfortable existence in the country with profit to the national cause."

In the same connection and at about the same time citizens of the German empire then abroad were ordered to return home at once on penalty of expatriation with loss of all rights as citizens.

This plan acutely affected Alsace-Lorraine, for on its rolls were undoubtedly thousands who were, as charged, "Germans only in name" many of whom had left for other countries as the war began. Thus were expatriated most of the intellectual leaders, including not only the avowed "nationalists" but also many conservatives, who had opposed the frenzied movements of Pan-Germanism.

The author of *L'Epreuve* cites many individual cases of punishment administered under the law of exception.

At the outset of the war, the French made a most ill-advised invasion of Alsace—unfortunate because the ground could not be held. All who gave the French army any sort of welcome were severely dealt with by the returning Germans. Here was a harvest for the informer.

At Gebweisler, a prominent manufacturer (M. de Bary), was sent to prison for pointing out to a French officer a bookstore where maps could be obtained. At Mühlhausen another manufacturer (Auguste Wagner) was imprisoned for three years on a wholly unproved charge of laying a map on the saddle of a French officer. A justice of the peace, Acker at Cernay, was similarly punished for opposing a German family from making up a black list for proscription.

A merchant of Mühlhausen (Meyer) was condemned to imprisonment for life for "high treason." The military

commandant set the verdict aside, summoning a new court to substitute a sentence of death. A woman of Colmar (Madame Blaise), was charged with warning the French commandant of a projected betrayal. She was acquitted for lack of evidence, but the German commandant (Gæde), annulled the decision, condemning her to ten years imprisonment because it was shown that whether guilty or not, "she was perfectly capable of committing the crime charged against her."

The usual brutalities were meted out for "seditious speech." Several journalists at Strassburg went to prison six months for the cry *Vive la France*. Others were similarly punished for *Vive la belle France*, and *Vive la République* as well as for singing the Marseillaise, itself an Alsatian protest against tyranny.

Similar punishments were given to some hundreds of people for leaving home without permission or for other infractions of military police regulations.

Punishments less severe, but equally insistent, were laid on those who wrote letters in French or who spoke it in public. All commercial letter-heads in French were destroyed. A citizen of Strassburg was sent to jail for eight days for writing his name Henri instead of Heinrich, and another for several months for calling himself Charles instead of Karl. In the prison at Strassburg, a newcomer was greeted in these words: "Do not weep, Madame, you will find here an excellent company, our house is the only one where one may speak French with impunity."

All these high-handed proceedings tend naturally to create counter-manifestations which led to still greater severity. A barber at Mühlhausen remarked, "No one dare speak in our country; we would better sew up our mouths." For this he went to jail for fifteen days. A milkman served a month for saying: "The Germans always speak of their victories, never of their defeats." A young woman spent a week in jail for waving her hand to French prisoners. Offenses of this kind led to the arrest and punishment of thousands of persons

A more important case was that of the Pastor Herzog of Waldersbach who declared that this was an "unjust war, provoked by Germany," omitting moreover to pray for the Emperor, in one of his services. For this he was imprisoned for a month.

Pastor Gerold of Strassburg, a man widely known and beloved, eighty years of age, was accused of giving money to wounded Frenchmen in the hospital. More than this, in a sermon he had uttered words "which wounded the German sentiments of a high functionary who was present." In substance, he had deplored the hard rule to which his people were subjected and prayed for the final triumph of justice. As punishment, he was imprisoned for a month.

In this connection, it may be well to remember that none of these acts are the work of lawless mobs, such as sometimes over-ride the law in more favored countries. The governmental machine in Germany reserves to itself all forms of tyranny, subject only to the still harsher rule of the military. The General Staff of the Army has always held civilian authority in contempt, and does not hesitate in the name of "military necessity" to set aside any manifestation of leniency of which civil authority may sometimes be guilty.

In spite of "necessary discipline," the "lost brothers" of Alsace, being German, are today farther than ever from being fully Germanized.

The author of *L'Epreuve* thus sums up the case:

When a people whose whole history is made up of struggles for political and intellectual independence sees at one stroke its traditions and all its liberties stricken down before a pitiless dictatorship, it reacts with all its vigor against the violence. Strong with the clear vision of men and things inherited from its fathers, it looks unfalteringly towards the new hope which rises on the horizon. (*L'Epreuve*, p. 69.)

IX

The question of Alsace-Lorraine is thus no longer a matter of the conflicting claims of two sovereign powers. It is a human problem, in which the people of Alsace and Lorraine on the one hand and the civilized world on the other

are primarily concerned. *To leave these people in the clutches of the absolutist Germany of to-day, would be to restore fugitive slaves to their masters.*

No such settlement can be made consistent with justice, and without justice Europe can have no lasting peace. The true aim of civilization is to secure freedom, order and justice, for with them peace will naturally follow, taking care of itself.

X

The Treaty of Frankfort in 1871 reduced 2,000,000 human beings to the status of a flock of sheep. The Treaty of Berlin in 1878, turned over 10,000,000 or more of Christianized people in Asia Minor and Macedonia to be hunted as vermin by a barbarian horde. By its consent to these achievements of monarchical order, Europe laid, broad and deep, the foundations for the world anarchy of today. "They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."